

REMARKS

In the Office Action, Claims 16-21 were allowed and Claims 1-10, 14 and 15 were objected to. The Office Action objected to Claims 1-10 in view of an informality regarding the words “dedicated control channel” in Claim 1, from which Claims 2-10 depend. Claims 14 and 15 were found to include allowable subject matter (Office Action, page 5), and were objected to due to their dependency from rejected Claim 11.

The Office Action rejected Claims 11-13, which had previously been allowed. Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,519,266 (Manning et al.); and Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Manning et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,419 (Gray et al.).

To advance prosecution of this application, Claims 11-15 have been cancelled, without prejudice.

Claims 1-10 and 16-21 are pending in this application.

The Examiner’s allowance of Claims 16-21 and indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 1-10 is gratefully acknowledged. The indication by the Examiner that Claims 2-10, which depend from Claim 1, would be allowable once the objection to Claim 1 is resolved (§7, at page 5 of the Office Action) is also gratefully acknowledged.

In regard to the objection to Claims 1-10, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner overlooked the fact that the term “dedicated control channel” does not appear at lines 3-4 in Claim 1, as alleged by the Examiner in the Office Action (at page 2). Rather, it is the term “dedicated channel” that appears at lines 3-4 of Claim 1. As explained in the

specification (at page 2, lines 17-19) a “dedicated channel” is exclusively used for communication between one specific mobile station and a base station. The “dedicated channel” includes a “dedicated control channel” and can include a fundamental channel and a supplemental channel. Thus, a “dedicated channel” differs from a “dedicated control channel.”

Accordingly, it is believed that the objection to Claims 1-10 should be withdrawn.

Claims 16-21 have been allowed and it is believed that Claims 1-10 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the application as now presented, containing Claims 1-10 and 16-21, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants’ attorney at the number given below.

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant(s)